

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 15, 2001

LB 851

out into central Nebraska and had to address...adjust it for population; the 1st District lay north of the Platte River, and with a little adjustment for the residents of the incumbent in the 1st District, and nobody would be happy? The way we are now we have most of the people happy, a few unhappy. We could fix this, Mr. Speaker, so that everyone was unhappy. Again, I have to rise in support of the committee amendment for two reasons, of course the least of which, the least of which is as Chair of the Redistricting Committee, I believe it's my responsibility to represent and defend on the floor of this body the amendment that's presented to us from that committee. It was well discussed. A lot of options were looked at and the majority of the committee felt that this was the better of the options that were presented in the Executive Session of the Redistricting Committee. And I do support that vote of the committee. But more importantly, I think, is my responsibility as a representative of the citizens of the 32nd District, who have...much has been said about north...northeast central Nebraska as losing districts. Consistently, for the last 20 years, most of the shift in the Congressional districts has been in southeast Nebraska. And as a matter of fact, one of the more interesting suggestions that I heard, and it was, Senator Vrtiska, only a suggestion, was why not take Gage, Pawnee and Richardson Counties and put those areas into the 3rd District. It's a little hard to come up with a good response to a suggestion of that type. Community of interest is important when all other things are equal. Deviation is, in fact, equal. The committee plan, .0005, decimal points, five ten-thousandths of one, five one-hundredths of 1 percent deviation, folks, that's zero. Any plan can be drawn by using census blocks to absolute zero but you will not have areas that in places are logical, understandable, or even recognizable by going in...into the zero deviation. We are at zero. We are at zero with the Bromm amendment for any kind of a challenge. They are both at zero. What our rules say, that if a plan that is closer to the ideal deviation is presented, we must consider that plan. We don't have to adopt it if it violates some of the other principles that we have found to be rational state policy. I think that what we have before us in the current form of the bill, with the Bromm amendment attached, reflects less rational state policy than what the Redistricting Committee's original